

Comptroller General of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

## **Decision**

Matter Of:

Midwest Contracting, Inc.

File No.:

B-259281

Date:

November 30, 1994

## DECISION

Midwest Contracting, Inc. protest the rejection of bid by the Department of the Navy under solicitation No. N68711-94-B-0884.

The protest, as filed with our Office, does not establish a basis for challenging the agency's action and, accordingly, must be dismissed.

The jurisdiction of our Office is established by the bid protest provisions of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3551-3556 (1988). Our role in resolving bid protests is to ensure that the statutory requirements for full and open competition are met. Brown Assocs. Mgmt. Servs., Inc.—Request for Recon., B-235906.3, Mar. 16, 1990, 90-1 CPD ¶ 299.

To achieve this end, our Bid Protest Regulations require that a protest include a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of a protest, 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(c)(4), and that the grounds stated be legally sufficient. 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(e). These requirements contemplate that protesters will provide, at a minimum, either allegations or evidence sufficient, if uncontradicted, to establish the likelihood that the protester will prevail in its claim of improper agency action. Robert Wall Edge—Request for Recon., 68 Comp. Gen. 352 (1989), 89-1 CPD § 335.

Here, Midwest only states that it "is formally protesting...the wrongful rejecting of the referenced bid.... Please consider this to be our formal notice of protest." Midwest provided no further allegations or supporting documentation. Therefore, this protest does not include sufficient factual information to establish the likelihood that the agency here violated applicable procurement laws or regulations. Accordingly, it must be dismissed without further action.

Ronald Berger

Associate General Counsel